

Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed July 12, 2007. This Response REPLACES the Response previously filed by Applicant on April 20, 2007. Applicant believes no additional fee is due with this communication.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, Claims 1-28 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, the Drawings and the Specification were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as being indefinite. Claims 1-14 and 16-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a Microsoft Windows Operating System embedded with a standard word editor, and user programs within the computer system.

A Response was filed by Applicant on April 20, 2007. However, in the subsequent Office Action mailed July 12, 2007, the Office indicated that the Response was non-responsive, in that all of the original claims had been canceled, and that the newly added claims, if added, would be drawn to a non-elected invention. (MPEP 821.03).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply cancels original Claims 1-28, and Claims 29-49 that had been added by way of the Response filed April 20, 2007; and adds new Claims 50-70, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 50-70.

III. Drawings

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, the Drawings were objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, a set of Replacement Drawing Sheets for Figures 1 to 3 are enclosed herewith. Subject to the approval of the Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests that the Replacement Drawing Sheets be included in the Application and replace those originally filed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments correct informalities in the drawings, and that no new matter is being added.

IV. Specification

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, the Specification was objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments correct informalities in the Specification and that no new matter is being added.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 1-28 have been canceled, and replaced with new Claims 50-70 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, Claims 1-14 and 16-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 1-14 and 16-28 have been canceled, and replaced with new Claims 50-70 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VII. Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action mailed November 20, 2006, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by a Microsoft Windows Operating System embedded with a standard word editor, and user programs within the computer system.

Claims 1-28 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 50-70 have been newly added by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that new Claims 50-70 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and consideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Applicant believes no additional fee is due with this communication. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 13, 2007

By: /Karl F. Kenna/

Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800